

27th March 1929]

(b) whether any attempt was made to ascertain public opinion on the matter before the proposal was made;

(c) whether the Government have any idea of ascertaining public opinion in the matter before coming to a final decision;

(d) whether the Government have received a copy of the resolutions passed at a crowded public meeting held at Palladam on the 17th day of February 1929 and attended by people from all parts of the taluk, including the town of Tiruppur; and

(e) whether Palladam or Tiruppur is more central for the whole taluk and whether crimes are committed more round Palladam or Tiruppur?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) There is no such proposal under the consideration of the Government or the Board of Revenue.

(d) The Government have received a copy of the proceedings of a public meeting of the citizens of Palladam taluk held on the 17th February 1929.

(e) The Government have not considered the question.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ May I know whether the Collector has not sent a communication on this matter ? ”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ All the information that Government have is that there is no such proposal either with the Board or the Government.”

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know whether the Collector has already considered and dropped the proposal altogether ? ”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ I am not aware, Sir.”

Loans

Advances under the Land Improvements and Agriculturists Loans Acts.

* 1981 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the amounts advanced in each year from 1920-21 under Land Improvement Loans Act and under Agriculturists Loans Act;

(b) the amounts collected in each such years;

(c) the amounts written off, if any;

(d) the total amounts due under each of the above Acts;

(e) the interest charged; and

(f) the funds from which the above amounts are lent?

A.—(a), to (e) The hon. Member is referred to statements 16 and 17 appended to the annual jamabandi reports which have been published.

(f) The advances are being met partly from borrowings from the Government of India (from 1925-26 Provincial Loans Fund) and partly from recoveries under Loans and Advances by the Provincial Government. During the financial years 1921-22

[27th March 1929]

to 1924-25, the amounts borrowed were for the net outgoings, under the two Acts. The amounts borrowed since 1925-26 were as follows :—

						LAKHS.
1925-26	26'05
1926-27	26'33
1927-28	8'52

[For further list of starred questions, please see page 965 infra.]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Excise

Alleged resignation of the member representing Mannargudi Municipal Council from the Excise Licensing Board.

1982 Q.—Mr. K. S. SIVASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the member representing the Municipal Council, Mannargudi, in the Excise Licensing Board has resigned;

(b) if so, for what reasons; and

(c) whether it is a fact that there is no representative of the municipal council in the Licensing Board now?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The hon. Member presumably refers to the Excise Advisory Committee constituted for the Mannargudi Revenue division. The Government are not aware that the fact is as suggested. They have called for a report.

Public Health

Leave and other privileges to rural medical practitioners.

1983 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that medical practitioners in charge of rural dispensaries are not given any leave except casual leave;

(b) whether it is a fact that these rural medical men are asked to do 'cholera' work without any remuneration or carriage or other allowance;

(c) whether it is a fact that in G.O. Mis. No. 447, dated 28th February 1928, it is stated that these practitioners are neither Government servants nor servants of local bodies; and

(d) if so, why G.O. No. 506, Public, dated 1st June 1927, calling upon Government servants not to subscribe to the Khadi Fund (A.I.S.A.) has been officially sent to these rural practitioners in R.O.C. No. 1027-27?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) It is so stated not in G.O. No. 447, P.H., dated 28th February 1928, but in G.O. No. 1701, P.H., dated 17th August 1925.

(d) The Government Order was not officially sent to them either by the Government or by any subordinate officer.